



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/000,456	12/04/2001	Michael Kagan	3891-0101P	9182

7590 01/17/2008
Mark M. Friedman
Dr. Mark Friedman Ltd.
c/o Discovery Dispatch
9003 Florin Way
Upper Marlboro, MD 20772

EXAMINER

DIVECHA, KAMAL B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2151

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/17/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/000,456

Applicant(s)

KAGAN ET AL.

Examiner

KAMAL B. DIVECHA

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19,31-49 and 60-66 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19,31-49 and 60-66 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-12, 14, 16-19, 31, 33, 39, 41-42, 44, 46-49, 64-66 are pending.

Claims 2, 10, 13, 15, 32, 40, 43, 45 and 60-63 are cancelled.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed on October 29, 2007 in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on November 19, 2007 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments in the submission filed on November 19, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response filed, applicant argues in substance that:

- a. One difference between the present invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 31 and the prior art cited by the Examiner relates to the recited gather engine, that gathers both write data for outgoing write request packets and read data for outgoing read response packets via a commonly shared data flow path (remarks, pg. 21-22).

In response to argument [a], Examiner respectfully disagrees.

On page 22 of remarks, applicant submits the following:

Petty et al. '714 are silent concerning whether bus router 306 includes the equivalent of the gather engine of independent claims 1 and 31. The Examiner identified the interface adapter illustrated in Figure 7 of Gasbarro et al. '004 as including the functionality of the gather engine of independent claims 1 and 31. That this is not the case can be appreciated from Gasbarro et al. '004 column 14 lines 24-28:

Typically the Micro-Engine (ME) 710 that controls the Send Queue (SQ) may be referred to SQ Micro-Engine (ME), and likewise the Micro-Engine (ME) 710 that controls the Receive Queue (RQ) may be referred to as RQ Micro-Engine (ME). (emphasis added)

In other words, host fabric adapter 120 of Gasbarro et al. '004 has at least two Micro-Engines 710, one for the Send Queue and one for the Receive Queue. This is the same configuration as that of the prior art HCA described in the specification of the above-identified patent application on page 3 lines 22-24:


To handle the dual role of requester and responder, IB HCAs known in the art typically have separate, independent transmit and receive hardware structures.

In the specific case of host fabric adapter 120 of Gasbarro et al. '004, one Micro-Engine 710 is the transmit hardware structure and the other Micro-Engine 710 is the receive hardware structure. By contrast, the gather engine of independent claims 1 and 31 is a component of "common hardware resources" (page 4 line 21) that handles "both requester and responder communication flows" (page 4 lines 20-21). Specifically, the general operation of the gather engine is described in page 5 lines 8-26 of the specification as follows:

In the submission above, applicant argues that Gasbarro teaches at least two Micro-Engines (710), whereas the gather engine of independent claim 1 and 31 is a component of "common hardware resources" that handles both requestor and responder communications flows.

However, applicant failed to note that Gasbarro teaches using one or more DMA engines, i.e. Micro-engines, to build, send, receive and acknowledge Infiniband packets, See col. 13 L65 to col. 14 L28. (Emphasis added)

In other words, the send queue functions and receive queue functions and/or requestor and responder functions/flows can be implemented by a single or one Micro-engine, as shown in figure 7 item #710 which is reproduced herein, thus resulting in a commonly shared data path.



As such, Gasbarro does teach and disclose the gather engine as disclosed in claim 1 and

Furthermore, applicant refers to the specification, page 5 lines 8-26 for the general operation of the gather engine (remarks, pg. 22), however, it should be note that although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant in remarks filed, pg. 23, further submits:

“specifically, the commonly shared data path is the arrow in figure 2 from execution unit 60 to SDE 66.”

On the other hand, the claim recites:

A network interface adapter, comprising...wherein the outgoing packet generator comprises a gather engine, which is coupled to gather both the write data and the read data from the system memory for inclusion in the respective outgoing packets via a common shared data flow path...

That is, the "common shared data flow path" as in the claim is not equivalent to the commonly shared data path referred and submitted by the applicant.

At best, the claimed limitation suggests the common shared data flow path between the gather engine and the system memory since gather engine obtains the write and read data from the system memory.

Therefore, applicant is suggested to clarify and distinctly claim the feature in view of the specification in order to differentiate the claimed invention from the cited prior art.

b. Another difference between the present invention and the prior art cited by the Examiner relates to the nature of the incoming read request packet and the nature of the response descriptor consequently written by the incoming packet processor, i.e. arguments pertaining to dependent claims 65-66 (remarks, pg. 24-25).

In response to argument [b], Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Claim 65 recites:

An adapter according to claim 1, wherein the incoming read request packet is a RDMA read request packet and wherein the response descriptor is a quasi-WQE.

As set forth above, Gasbarro clearly discloses utilizing a single Micro-engine for handling the Infiniband packets; for example, see col. 13 L5 to col. 14 L28.

Gasbarro further teaches posting the work requests in the form of “WQEs” (data movement operations such as message send/receive operations and RDMA read/write operations) to the work queue pairs associated with a given fabric adapter (HCA), for example, col. 13 L20-36.

In other words, Gasbarro discloses a host channel adapter capable of receiving an incoming read request packet such as RDMA read request packet, and preparing the WQEs, i.e. response descriptor, for the transportation of the data.

Furthermore, applicant on pg. 25 of remarks submits:

In rejecting claims 65 and 66, the Examiner identified the quasi-WQE recited therein with the WQEs illustrated in Pettey et al. '712 Figure 7b. That this is a misidentification can be appreciated from the description of InfiniBand Send Queue operations in Gasbarro et al. '004 column 7 lines 41-50:

There may be several classes of Send Queue operations, including Send, Remote Memory Access (RDMA), and Memory Binding. For a Send operation, the WQE specifies a block of data in the consumer's memory space for the hardware to send to the destination, letting a receive WQE already queued at the destination specify where to place that data. For an RDMA operation, the WQE also specifies the address in the remote consumer's memory. Thus an RDMA operation does not need to involve the receive work queue of the destination. (emphasis added)

In other words, the InfiniBand standard does not define the creation of a WQE in response to the receipt of a RDMA read request. Note that DRDMA Write WQE 800 of Pettey et al. '712 is created in response to the receipt of a SEND packet, not in response to the receipt of a RDMA read request packet. Note, also, that Pettey et al. '712 themselves teach against creating a WQE in response to the receipt of a RDMA read request packet, in column 14 lines 61-65:

If the received packet is a RDMA Read Request packet 1200 then no data is transferred by the RxPP logic 1416. Instead, the RxPP logic 1416 forwards the received packet to the TxPP logic 1414 for creation of an outgoing RDMA Read Response packet 1300. (emphasis added)

thereby skipping the step of RxPP logic 1416 making (column 14 lines 57-59)

...the association between an incoming IB packet and the appropriate one of the many TCA 202 QPs 712

(where the WQEs are according to Figure 7b). The present invention, as recited in dependent claims 65 and 66, remedies this lacuna, to enable the use of the same

It is unclear as to how the underlined feature does not define the creation of a WQE in response to the receipt of a RDMA read request?

The feature suggest the non-involvement of the receive work queue of the destination, i.e. remote consumer's receive work queue, and not the consumer's work queue.

In fact, it is clear from the cited passage, for example: col. 7 lines 32-67, that the Infiniband standard in Gasbarro utilizes the WQE which also specifies the address in the remote consumer's memory for an RDMA operation such as RDMA Write, RDMA Read and Atomic.

It is also unclear as to how Pettey teach against creating a WQE in response to the receipt of the RDMA read request packet based on the fact that RxPP logic forwards the received packet to the TxPP logic for creation of an outgoing RDMA read response packet.

In fact, Pettey explicitly discloses the process wherein “when a CPU 208 of fig. 2 desires to send the host a message, it submits a work request to the TCA 202 Send Queue. The TCA creates a Work Queue Entry (WQE) and places the WQE on the Send Queue. Among the WQE types are RDMA Write WQE 762, RDMA Read WQE 763, DRDMA Write WQE 764, DRDMA Read WQE 765, and SEND WQE 766 (col. 11 L1-53)” and “an HCA that receives the RDMA read request packet and in response transmits a RDMA read response packet to the TCA, see col. 22 L47-49”.

As such, there is nothing in Pettey and/or Gasbarro that teaches away and/or against the features as submitted by the applicant.

Therefore, applicant’s arguments directed towards the distinction between the prior art and the claimed invention, based on the two major features, are considered not persuasive based on the reasoning as set forth above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

1. Claims 1, 3-9, 11-12, 14, 16-19, 31, 33-39, 41-42, 44, 46-49 and 64-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Pettey et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,594,712 B1) in view of Gasbarro et al. (hereinafter Gasbarro, U. S. Patent No. 6,948,004 B2).

As per claim 1, Pettey discloses a network interface adapter, comprising:

a host interface for coupling to a host processor (fig. 2 item #206, fig. 18b item #308);

an outgoing packet generator for delivery to a remote responder responsive to a request submitted by the host processor via the host interface col. 7 L65 to col. 8 L7, col. 14 L20-39, fig. 3 item #306);

a network output port, coupled to receive the request packet from the output packet generator, so as to transmit the outgoing request packet over a network to the remote responder (col. 9 L1-5, fig. 3 item #308);

a network input port, for coupling to the network so as to receive an incoming response packet from the remote responder, in response to the outgoing request packet sent thereto, and further to receive an incoming request packet sent by a remote requester (fig. 3 item #308 and fig. 2 item #204);

an incoming packet processor, coupled to the network input port so as to receive and process both the incoming response packet and the incoming request packet, and further coupled to cause the outgoing packet generator, responsive to the incoming request packet, to generate in addition to the outgoing request packet, an outgoing response packet for transmission via the network output port to the remote requester (col. 10 L4-9, col. 14 L40-54 and fig. 3 item #306),

wherein the outgoing request packet comprises an outgoing write request packet containing write data taken from a system memory accessible via the host interface (fig. 18a: describes the process of RDMA WRITE operation; fig. 16 shows the I/O WRITE operation),

wherein the outgoing response packet comprises an outgoing read response packet containing read data taken from the system memory in response to the incoming request packet (fig. 18a and fig. 16) and a scatter/gather list created by CPU (fig. 9), and

wherein the incoming request packet comprises an incoming read request packet specifying data to be read from a system memory accessible via the host interface (fig. 15: describes an incoming read request packet, and col. 11 L17-67, col. 13 L58 to col. 14 L9, L40-65 and col. 15 L65 to col. 16 L6);

wherein the incoming packet processor is adapted to write a response descriptor to a first memory location, in a memory separate from the network interface adapter, indicating the data to be read from the system memory responsive to the incoming read request packet (col. 14 L10-67, fig. 2 item #218, fig. 7B: the WQE are stored in local memory, separate from the TCA, and col. 25 L10-26);

wherein the outgoing packet processor is adapted to read the response descriptor from the first memory location and, responsive thereto, to read the indicated data and to generate outgoing response packet containing the indicated data (col. 9 L1-5, col. 11 L54 to col. 12 L67, col. 22 L39-67).

However, Pettay does not explicitly disclose the process of gathering both the write data and the read data from the system memory for inclusion in the respective outgoing packets via a commonly shared data flow path.

Gasbarro, from the same field of endeavor, explicitly discloses an interface adapter (fig. 7) comprising a gather engine providing a gather list describing virtual addresses to fetch outgoing whether it's a read or write data from local system memory for inclusion in the outgoing packets via a common shared data flow path (col. 8 L10-34, col. 11 L14-45, col. 12 L64 to col. 13 L5, col. 13 L5 to col. 14 L28, col. 15 L20-67, col. 21 L16-56: please also note that it is the inherent function of the gather engine to gather the data in response to either write or read request regardless of incoming and outgoing packets).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pettay in view of Gasbarro, in order to gather both the write

data and the read data from the system memory for inclusion in the respective outgoing packets, since Gasbarro teaches the process of gathering outgoing data from the system memory.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would have enabled the process of fetching outgoing data from system memory whether it's a read or write data (Gasbarro, col. 8 L28-34).

As per claim 3, Pettéy discloses an adapter wherein to submit the request, the host processor writes a request descriptor indicative of the write data to a second memory location, (this approach is known as double buffering, col. 11 L18 to col. 12 L45 and fig. 7b) and wherein the WQE includes SGL local address field for specifying the physical address in local memory of a scatter/gather list, however Pettéy does not disclose a process adapted to read information from the descriptors and to gather the read data and the write data responsive thereto.

Gasbarro discloses a scatter/gather engine adapted to read information from the indicators or descriptors and to gather or fetch the read data and the write data (col. 8 L28-41).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pettéy in view of Gasbarro, in order to read information from the descriptors and to gather or fetch the write data and the read data from the system memory, since Gasbarro teaches the process of gathering outgoing data from the system memory.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because of the same reasons as set forth in claim 1.

As per claim 4, Pettéy discloses an interface adapter wherein the outgoing packet generator comprises a plurality of schedule queues (fig. 7a block #108), and is adapted to generate the outgoing request packet (fig. 16) and the outgoing response packet responsive to

respective entries placed in the queues (fig. 18a item #1808, 1822, fig. 22a item #2224, 2226 and fig. 15).

As per claim 5, Pettey discloses an interface adapter wherein the network input and output ports are adapted to receive and send the incoming and outgoing packets, respectively, over a plurality of transport service instances, and wherein the outgoing request packet and the outgoing response packet are associated with respective instances among the plurality of transport service instances (fig. 7a item #108), and wherein the outgoing packet generator is adapted to assign the transport service instances to the queues based on service parameters of the instances, and to place the entries in the schedule queues corresponding to the transport service instances with which the incoming and outgoing packets are associated (col. 8 L2-26, col. 11 L1-36 and col. 14 L10-54 and col. 17 L20-40).

As per claim 6, Pettey discloses an adapter wherein the outgoing packet generator comprises one or more execution engines, which are adapted to generate the outgoing request packet and the outgoing response packet responsive to a list of work items respectively associated with each of the transport service instances (col. 1 L54 to col. 2 L21, col. 7 L65 to col. 8 L7, col. 11 L18-53), however Pettey does not disclose a scheduler, which is coupled to select the entries from the queues and to assign the instances to the execution engines for execution of the work items responsive to the service parameters.

Gasbarro discloses an adapter comprising a scheduler for scheduling the next virtual interface to the context manager and supporting priority of traffic for data packets associated with send Queue and Receive Queue of the work queue pair (col. 15 L50-58).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pettey in view Gasbarro, in order to include a scheduler for selecting the entries from the queues and to assign the instances to the execution engines for execution of the work items responsive to the service parameters.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because a scheduler would have supported the priority of traffic for data packets associated with Send queue and Receive queue of the work queue pair (Gasbarro, col. 15 L50-55).

As per claim 7, Pettey discloses an adapter wherein the transport service instances comprise queue pairs (fig. 7a-7b: shows plurality of queues including queue pairs).

As per claim 8, Pettey discloses an adapter wherein the outgoing packet generator comprises one or more control registers to which the host processor and incoming packet processor write in order to place the entries in the queues (Pettey, col. 17 L20-56), however Pettey does not explicitly disclose the one or more register to be a doorbell registers.

Gasbarro, from the same field of endeavor explicitly discloses a channel adapter comprising one or more doorbell registers (col. 15 L20-50).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pettey in view of Gasbarro, in order to replace the one or more control registers with the doorbell registers, since Gasbarro teaches and discloses the usage of doorbell registers.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because doorbell registers allows software the capability to enable automatic event generation, and making doorbell

registers memory mapped allows applications the ability to write those registers thereby controlling event generation (Gasbarro, col. 15 L20-32).

As per claim 9, Pettey discloses an adapter wherein the incoming request packet comprises a write request packet carried over the network on a reliable transport service, and wherein responsive to the incoming write request packet, the incoming packet processor is adapted to add an entry to the entries placed in the queues, such that responsive to the entry, the outgoing packet generator generates an acknowledgement packet (col. 19 L55 to col. 20 L33).

As per claim 11, Pettey discloses the process of receiving a read request (fig. 15 item #1000); the process of receiving a write request (fig. 16 item #1000); and the process of conveying or sending the write data to the host interface (fig. 15 item #1100), however Pettey does not disclose the process of receiving an incoming write request packet containing write data to be written to a system memory accessible via the host interface after receiving the incoming read request packet, and the process of conveying the write data to the host interface without waiting for execution of the response descriptor. But it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pettey (i.e. modify Pettey's figure 15 and 16 so that the incoming packet processor of the adapter (see the rejected claim 1) is configured so that the write request work queue entry is executed first with respect to read response work queue entry or response descriptor) in order to convey the write data to the host interface without waiting for execution of the read response work item, since Pettey teaches receiving incoming write request, receiving incoming read request packet, executing both of the requests, and conveying the write data to the host interface. One of ordinary skilled in the art

would have been motivated because it would have improved the efficiency and enhanced the performance of the interface adapter.

As per claim 12, Pettey discloses an adapter wherein the incoming packet processor is configured so that when it receives an incoming write request packet containing write data to be written to a system memory accessible via the host interface before receiving the incoming read request packet, it prevents execution of the read response work item or response descriptor until the write data have been written to the system memory (col. 21 L12 to col. 22 L6).

As per claim 14, Pettey discloses an adapter wherein the outgoing packet generator is adapted, upon generating the outgoing request packet, to notify the incoming packet processor to await the incoming response packet so as to write a completion message to the host interface when the awaited packet is received (col. 20 L17-32).

As per claim 16, Pettey discloses an adapter wherein the incoming read request packet is one of a plurality of incoming read request packets, and wherein the incoming packet processor is adapted to write a list of corresponding response descriptor to the first memory location each said response descriptor indicating the data to be read from the system memory responsive to the corresponding incoming read request packet, responsive to which the outgoing packet processor is adapted to generate the outgoing response packet as part of a sequence of such packets (fig. 19a, fig. 20 and fig. 9; col. 23 L20 to col. 24 L27; col. 11 L18-37, fig. 7b, fig. 2 and col. 14 L10-20).

As per claim 17, Pettey discloses an adapter wherein the network input and output ports are adapted to receive and send the incoming and outgoing packets, respectively, over a plurality of transport service instances, and wherein the incoming packet processor is adapted to prepare

the list of the response descriptors for each of the instances as a part of a response database held for the plurality of the instances in common (fig. 3 item #308, fig. 19b item #508, and fig. 23).

As per claim 18, Pettey discloses an adapter wherein the transport service instances comprise queue pairs (fig 7a item #712).

As per claim 19, Pettey discloses an adapter wherein the request comprises a write request, which is submitted by the host processor by generating a request descriptor indicating further data to be read from the system memory for inclusion in the outgoing packet (fig. 10), and wherein the output packet generator is adapted to read the request descriptor and, responsive thereto, to generate the outgoing request packet as a write request packet containing the indicated further data (fig. 18a item #1832; col. 12 L58 to col. 13 L18, col. 15 L17-31 and fig. 16).

As per claim 64, Pettey discloses an adapter wherein the memory separate from the network interface is the system memory (fig. 2 item #218).

As per claim 65, Pettey discloses an adapter wherein the incoming read request packet is a RDMA read request packet and wherein the response descriptor is a quasi-WQE (Pettey: i.e. work item, fig. 7b, col. 11 L1-53; Gasbarro: col. 7 L33-67, col. 13 L15 to col. 14 L28).

As per claims 31, 33-39, 41-42, 44, 46-49 and 66, they do not teach or further define over the limitations in claims 1, 3-9, 11-12, 14-19 and 64-65. Therefore claims 31, 33-39, 41-42, 44, 46-49 and 66 are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claims 1, 3-9, 11-12, 14-19 and 64-65.

Additional References

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. Beukema et al., U. S. Patent No. 6,578,122 B2.
- b. Avery, U. S. Patent No. 6,611,883 B1.
- c. Thomas et al., U. S. Patent No. 5,922,046.
- d. Coffman et al., U. S. Patent No. 6,718,370 B1.

Conclusion

This Action is made Non-Final.

Examiner's Remarks: The teachings of the prior art should not be restricted and/or limited to the citations by columns and line numbers, as specified in the rejection. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in its entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner, in order to move prosecution forward.

In the case of amendments, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and support, for ascertaining the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

Application/Control Number:
10/000,456
Art Unit: 2151

Page 19

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KAMAL B. DIVECHA whose telephone number is 571-272-5863. The examiner can normally be reached on Increased Flex Work Schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kamal Divecha/

Kamal Divecha
Art Unit 2151

 **JOHN FOLLANSBEE**
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100